

On the Principle of Equivalence

Luca Fabbri

INFN & Gruppo Teorici, Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Bologna

GPP, Département de Physique de l'Université de Montréal

PACS: 04.20.-q · 04.20.Cv

Abstract

We discuss the Principle of Equivalence in its relationship with Weyl Theorem to induce the interpretation of gravity as geometrical effect; this geometrization of gravity is meaningful only if the geometry is restricted in a certain way. We show what is the most general geometry in which gravity can be geometrized according to the fundamental idea expressed through Weyl theorem by the Principle of Equivalence.

1 Introduction

The Principle of Equivalence lies at the foundations of theories of gravitation: it states that among all the possible physical fields, only gravity displays the special feature of being negligible at least in a given point of a given system of reference; because of this peculiar character gravity has similarities with non-inertial forces, and this allows the possibility to consider gravitation as a geometric effect. Thus more specifically, we can say that the Principle of Equivalence lies at the foundations of all those theories in which gravitation has a geometric character.

In order to achieve this geometrization of gravity, it is necessary to consider the geometry and require its structure to be constrained in such a way that it can automatically account for the gravitational field. This can be done by means of Weyl Theorem under the conditions of having metric symmetric connections: Weyl theorem under these assumptions states that the connection has the feature of being removable at least in a given point with a given choice of the system of coordinates; because of this peculiar character of the connection, it is evident that the gravitational field and the connection have analogies in their behaviour, and this allows the possibility to consider gravitation as contained in the connection of a space, thus allowing gravity to be geometrized.

Under this point of view, it appeared clear that so long as the Principle of Equivalence was supposed to found gravity as a geometric theory, the geometry had to be structured in terms of metric symmetric connections solely; and in fact in the most commonly used textbooks such as [1] and [2] metric symmetric connections are assumed, in some [3] it is also shown that this is the most general form the connection can have if Newton's Law is considered and finally in [4] it is even proved that this is the most general form the connection can have using only geometrical arguments.

However, the reasoning employed in [4] is affected by a basic flaw, the arguments in [3] are correct but not applicable in general, and the fact that in [2] and [1] those constraints for the connection are assumed without any further justification is more a way to simplify the structure of the geometry, than a fundamental assumption.

In fact, the requirement for which the connections have to be constrained to be symmetric and metric is not a fundamental assumption at all, and we could think to weaken the previously imposed constraints getting more general connections; and in fact, despite the current main stream, a small part of the literature does deal with these enlarged geometries. But on the other hand, in general we would get geometries that are too loosened, losing the possibility to geometrize gravity, as required by the Principle of Equivalence; indeed as explained in [5] and also in [6], if it is upon these geometries that the theory of gravity is built, then in these theories of gravitation the Principle of Equivalence can not be implemented.

So we have, on the one hand, the standard most restricted theory of gravity that is geometrizable, and, on the other hand, generalized theories of gravity that are not geometrizable because based upon too enlarged geometries; thus from the foundational point of view, it is interesting to see whether between these two cases there is no third case, or if it is possible to have a theory of gravity that respects the Principle of Equivalence, hence being geometrizable, but that is also more general than the standard theory.

In the present paper, while extending a result discussed also in [7], we will give an affirmative answer to this question.

2 The Principle of Equivalence

The Principle of Equivalence states that a given gravitational field can be removed locally by a suitable choice of the system of reference.

In order to have a theory of gravity with a geometrical character, we have to develop the geometrical background, and this background is constructed upon the tensorial, or absolute calculus.

Absolute calculus is built upon two fundamental tensors, which are the Metric Tensors $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $g^{\mu\nu}$ such that $g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\nu\mu}$ and $g^{\mu\nu} = g^{\nu\mu}$ and also such to verify the inversion condition $g_{\mu\nu}g^{\nu\rho} = \delta_\mu^\rho$ where δ_μ^ρ is the Kronecker Delta Tensor; absolute differential calculus is built upon the Connection $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ defined in terms of its transformation law, and it is used to define the Covariant Derivative D_μ acting on tensors: once these two fundamental quantities are given, it is possible to calculate the covariant derivative of the metric tensors themselves given by $D_\sigma g_{\mu\nu}$, it is possible to define in terms of the connection alone the quantity given by $Q_{\alpha\beta}^\rho = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\rho - \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^\rho$ that is a tensor called Cartan Torsion Tensor, and then it is possible to define

$$\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\sigma}(\partial_\nu g_{\mu\sigma} + \partial_\mu g_{\nu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma g_{\mu\nu}) \quad (1)$$

which is a connection called Levi-Civita Connection, also

$$L_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\sigma}(D_\nu g_{\mu\sigma} + D_\mu g_{\nu\sigma} - D_\sigma g_{\mu\nu}) \quad (2)$$

which is a tensor, and

$$K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} = \frac{1}{2} (Q_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} + Q_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}) \quad (3)$$

which is a tensor, and with all these quantities we have that the expression

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} = \Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} - L_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} + K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} Q_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} \quad (4)$$

represents the most general decomposition of the connection.

The symmetry properties in the two lower indices and the transformation law defining the connection have an interesting relationship expressed by Weyl Theorem, which states that it is possible to find a suitable choice of the system of coordinates in which locally the symmetric part in the two lower indices of a connection can be made to vanish.

Given this background, the geometrization of gravity takes place by considering that geometrically speaking, the Principle of Equivalence can be translated into Weyl theorem by saying that gravity must be contained in the symmetric part of the connection: in this case, the gravitational degrees of freedom will disappear as the symmetric part of the connection becomes zero by the local choice of the system of coordinates.

The problem however is that whereas the gravitational field is a physical field, and thus uniquely defined, the connection has $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} - L_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} + K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ but it also has $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} - L_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ and also $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} + K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ and finally $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ as possible symmetric parts, and it is not clear which one of these symmetric parts actually contains the gravitational informations; it is thus obvious that to implement a principle that regards a unique gravitational field, the symmetric parts of the connection have to be restricted as to be uniquely defined as well.

In order to achieve this unambiguous definition of the symmetric part of the connection, we have thus to demand that all the possible symmetric parts collapse on one symmetric part only; this means that we have to require the conditions $L_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} = 0$ and $K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} = 0$ to have that the symmetric part of the connection reduces to $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ solely. The first condition is equivalent to the condition given by $D_{\rho}g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ while the second to $Q_{\rho\mu\nu} = Q_{[\rho,\mu,\nu]}$, that is metric connections with completely antisymmetric Cartan torsion tensors.

We notice that in [7], Xin Yu assumes metric connections, so that starting from the Principle of Equivalence, using Weyl theorem, the complete antisymmetry of Cartan torsion is implied; however, the result can be improved so that starting from the principle of Equivalence, using Weyl theorem, the complete antisymmetry of Cartan torsion tensors for metric connections is implied, and moreover this demonstration is based upon the implicit hypothesis that the system of coordinates and in it the point in which the different symmetric parts of the connection vanish is unique, while this hypothesis can in general be assumed only in the case of complete antisymmetry of the Cartan torsion tensors of metric connections.

Summarizing, the procedure for which starting from the Principle of Equivalence, through Weyl theorem, the complete antisymmetry of Cartan torsion tensors for metric connections is obtained is not what it should be done, rather completely antisymmetric Cartan torsion tensors for metric connections have to be assumed, in order to have an unambiguous statement of Weyl theorem, for the representation of the Principle of Equivalence.

So, all other more general connections do not allow the possibility to have an unambiguous representation of gravity in terms of the geometry, thus forbidding the Principle of Equivalence to find its place within their scheme, as explained in [6] and [5] by Aldrovandi and Pereira and by Aldrovandi, Pereira and Vu.

But also, it is clear that in general the Cartan torsion tensor is not zero, although some authors have tried to show that this should be the case.

For example, in [4], Landau and Lifshitz prove that torsion has to be zero by using only geometric arguments; however with the very same reasoning one could also prove that curvature should be zero: in their proof they assume what they want to prove, and it is fallacious. Thus we are not going to consider it any further.

However, there are other authors who have linked the vanishing of torsion to physical principles.

In order to follow their reasoning, we remind the reader that as the principle of equivalence concerns the essence of the gravitational field, we can shift the discussion from the gravitational field of accelerations in which a material body can be to the gravitational accelerations felt by material bodies themselves; then we pass from the discussion in terms of a field to the discussion regarding the motion of material bodies in this field.

The covariant form of the law that is used to describe this motion is the covariant Newton's Law, which is given upon defining the covariant line element as $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu$, and also the covariant velocity $u^\mu = \frac{dx^\mu}{ds}$, as

$$u^\alpha D_\alpha u^\mu = 0 \quad (5)$$

in the free case, and whose expansion in terms of the acceleration $w^\mu = \frac{du^\mu}{ds}$ is given as

$$w^\mu + \Gamma_{\rho\alpha}^\mu u^\rho u^\alpha = 0 \quad (6)$$

called Autoparallel Equation; it is clear that in the spurious term because of the presence of the symmetric tensor $u^\rho u^\alpha$ only the symmetric part of the connection is selected, and this equation reduces to

$$w^\mu + \Lambda_{\rho\alpha}^\mu u^\rho u^\alpha = 0 \quad (7)$$

called Geodesic Equation: thus the straightest and the shortest trajectories coincide. Otherwise said, torsion does not affect the motion of bodies governed by Newton's Law, and because Newton's Law rules over the dynamics of bodies in macroscopic situations, we can conclude that torsional degrees of freedom have no role in macroscopic situations.

Now, it is interesting to consider that in [3], Weinberg shows that torsion has to vanish, because he derives the torsionless theory of gravitation as the most general theory, starting from Newton's Law, beside the Principle of Equivalence; this could at first give rise to the belief that torsion is equal to zero, but a more careful analysis shows that torsion vanishes in this theory of gravitation precisely because it is based on Newton's Law other than the Principle of Equivalence itself, and because Newton's Law is substantially macroscopic, then we can conclude that in this book the author proves that torsion is zero in macroscopic situations only. Besides, in the mentioned textbook, the authors's point of view is motivated by having a theory of gravity that may eventually be compatible with principles of the microscopic domain whereas it is in terms of macroscopic physics that his discussion is entirely outlined.

This may be the reason for which also in the other mentioned textbooks [2] and [1], Misner, Thorne and Wheeler and Wald still consider torsion to be absent, namely, torsion is not needed precisely because physical laws of macroscopic validity are considered.

Gravity is considerably weak with respect to all other physical forces, and this fact may well let us forget about gravity without being too concerned for practical problems; but theoretically this would mean neglecting one of the forces of nature, and no matter how weak it might be, this would not be the most general situation, and thus fundamentally unacceptable.

Thus, it should be clear that in general Cartan torsion tensor does not vanish, but on the other hand it is clear that the completely antisymmetric Cartan torsion tensor is the most general form of the most general tensor that can be in the most general connection, still permitting the symmetric part of the connection to represent gravity as required by Weyl theorem, realizing the physical meaning of the Equivalence Principle.

3 Conclusion

In the present paper, we have showed that a space endowed with metric connections with completely antisymmetric Cartan torsion tensors defines the most general structure that can permit gravitational effects to be expressed by geometrical quantities; in this geometry, the geometrical Weyl Theorem becomes the expression of the physical Principle of Equivalence permitting gravity to be geometrized.

It has been discussed that using different connections to structure the geometry would result in two complementary diseases, either in a loss of generality, or in the exclusion of the Principle of Equivalence from the geometrical scheme.

Acknowledgments. I wish to thank Professor Manu B. Paranjape and Professor Richard MacKenzie for their constructive critics. Part of the work has been financially supported by NSERC of Canada.

References

- [1] Robert Wald, “General Relativity”. University Of Chicago Press (1984).
- [2] Charles Misner, Kip Thorne and John Archibald Wheeler, “Gravitation”. Freeman (1973).
- [3] Steven Weinberg, “Gravitation and Cosmology”. Wiley (1972).
- [4] Lev Landau and Evgeny Lifshitz, “The Classical Theory of Fields”. Butterworth-Heinemann (1980).
- [5] R. Aldrovandi, J. G. Pereira and K. H. Vu, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **36**, 101 (2004).
- [6] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie* **32-2**, 229 (2007).
- [7] Xin Yu, *Astrophysical and Space Science*, **154**, 321 (1989).